

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Claims 1, 10, 16 and 21 have been amended to indicate that each of the plurality of ports are capable of physically receiving a peripheral component for communication with a remote processing unit, wherein each peripheral component is one of an input device, an output device and an input/output device. New claim 25 has been added. Applicants believe that no new matter has been added by way of the aforementioned claim amendments.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,802,010 to Kim et al. (“Kim”). The current Office action at pages 2-3 and 9-10 cites Kim’s wireless receiving panel 380 as being analogous to the claimed remote connector and cites Kim’s general purpose input/output (“GPIO”) 347, which appears to be an interface or terminal that is part of the PCI-to-ISA Bridge 345 (Col. 6, ll. 15-35; Col. 7, ll. 25-27), keyboard 100 and wireless remote control 400’ as being analogous to the peripheral components that are capable of being received by the claimed plurality of ports. In making the latter comparison, the Office action states on page 3 that the claimed ports allegedly correspond to the signal lines of Kim’s Fig. 8 connecting the wireless receiving panel 380 to the PCI-ISA Bridge 345, keyboard controller 385 and the remote device 400’. The Examiner further states at page 10 of the instant Office action that:

The [wireless receiver] panel 380 comprises necessary interfaces to receive wireless signal[s]. A port is an interface. If [wireless receiving panel] 380 does not have necessary interfaces, [then remote controls] 400’ and 400” cannot communicate with 380. Thus, [wireless receiver panel] 380 has plural ports, or interfaces, to receive the signal from 400’ and 400”. [The claim] does not require that peripheral components have to be attached physically with the ports of the remote connector.

Applicants respectfully submit that the aforementioned rejection ignores claim language such as the claim requirement that the “remote connector compris[es] a plurality of ports, each of the plurality of ports capable of receiving a peripheral device.” Applicants further submit that the aforementioned rejection ignores that each of the alleged “peripheral components” in Kim are integral components of the same “thing” and thus are not peripheral components.

However, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10, 16 and 21 to advance prosecution. For example, claim 1 now requires that the remote connector comprises a plurality of ports, each of the plurality of ports capable of physically receiving a peripheral component for communication with a remote processing unit, wherein each peripheral component is one of an input device, an output device and an input/output device. Applicants respectfully submit that Kim’s wireless receiving panel 380 does not appear to have a plurality of ports that are capable of physically receiving a peripheral component for communication with a remote processing unit, wherein each peripheral component is one of an input device, an output device and an input/output device. For instance, Kim’s alleged ports connecting the wireless receiving panel 380 to Kim’s GPIO 347, keyboard controller 385 and wireless remote control 400-400” are not analogous to the claimed ports because none of these alleged ports are capable of physically receiving an input device, an output device or an input/output device.

More particularly, the GPIO 347 appears to be an interface or terminal that is part of a PCI-to-ISA bridge 345 that allows for, among other things, communication between the CPU 325 of system 300 and the wireless receiving panel 380 (See Fig. 5). The GPIO interface or terminal 347 does not appear to be one of a input device, an output device or an input/output device. Further, the only role the GPIO interface of terminal 347 appears to have in communication with the wireless receiving panel 380 is as a conduit for status system status

from a shell program 632 information through signal line 370 (Figs. 5, 8; Col. 6, ll. 31-34, discussing the output portion of the interface/terminal; Col. 7, ll. 42-44).

Similarly, keyboard controller 385 appears to process inputted key scan codes from wireless remote controls 400-400'' or from keyboard 100. The keyboard controller 385 is part of the Super I/O 360, which also appears to be an interface for inputs and outputs to the system 300. (See Fig. 5). Keyboard 100 communicates with keyboard controller 385 using signal line 365, which is the same communication line that the wireless receiving panel 380 uses to communicate with the Super I/O 360. (Col. 6, ll. 45-53; Table 1 in Col. 6). In other words, keyboard 100 is not coupled as an input device to the wireless receiving panel 380. At best, keyboard 100 is coupled to a Super I/O 360 for communication with the PCI-to-ISA bridge 345. (Fig. 5).

Finally, wireless remote control devices 400-400'' do not appear to be capable of being physically received by any ports associated with the wireless receiving panel 380. Instead, as clearly shown in the figures, wireless remote control devices 400-400'' communicate wirelessly with the wireless receiving panel 380.

Because Kim's wireless receiving panel 380 does not have a plurality of ports, each of the plurality of ports being capable of physically receiving a peripheral component for communication with a remote processing unit, wherein each peripheral component is one of an input device, an output device and an input/output device, Kim does not appear to be an anticipatory reference of claim 1.

Each of claims 2-3, 5 and 8 depend upon allowable claim 1 and are believe to contain additional novel, non-obvious and patentable subject matter. Thus, for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, each of claims 2-3, 5 and 8 are believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

Claims 4, 6 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim. Each of claims 4, 6 and 9 depend upon allowable claim 1 and are believed to contain additional novel, non-obvious and patentable subject matter. Thus, for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1, each of claims 4, 6 and 9 are believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

Claims 10, 12-22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,005,966 to Leman et al. (“Leman”). Each of independent claims 10, 16 and 21 have been amended to contain the same or similar language as presented above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above with respect to claim 1. Because Leman has only been cited as allegedly teaching an application of two power sources, each of claims 10, 16 and 21 are also believed to be allowable over the cited publications for at least the same reasons as identified above.

Claims 12-15, 17-20, 22 and 24 depend upon an allowable base claim and are believed to contain additional novel, non-obvious and patentable subject matter. Thus, for at least the same reasons as set forth above, each of claims 12-15, 17-20, 22 and 24 are believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

New claim 25 has been added. Applicants respectfully note that new claim 25 requires, among other things, that the remote connector is operably remote with respect to a computing system, and has a plurality of ports, each of the plurality of ports capable of receiving a peripheral component for communication with the computing system. Applicants note that Kim appears to be silent as to these limitations present in claim 25. At best, Kim appears to be drawn to a wireless receiving panel 380 that is an integral part of computing system 300 and that is capable of wirelessly receiving communication signals from one or more wireless remote

controls 400-400” for communication with the computing system 300, namely CPU 325. In other words, the alleged remote connector in Kim is not remote to a computer system that communicates with peripheral components, but rather is an integral component of the computer system. For at least this reason, claim 25 is believed to be in proper condition for allowance.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 24, 2008

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/
Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2600
Chicago, Illinois 60601
phone: (312) 609-7599
fax: (312) 609-5005